



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

June 4, 2014

Indiana Government Center South
Conference Room B
302 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Board Members Present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz (chair), Mr. Troy Albert, Dr. David Freitas, Mr. Gordon Hendry, Ms. Andrea Neal, Dr. Brad Oliver, Mr. B.J. Watts, Mr. Tony Walker, and Ms. Cari Whicker.

Dr. David Freitas and Mr. Dan Elsener (secretary) attended by phone.

Board Members Absent: Ms. Saran O'Brien.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Superintendent Ritz called the meeting to order and roll was called. The roll reflected all members present except Ms. Sarah O'Brien. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Freitas requested an agenda item be added to initiate rulemaking regarding the student growth component of teacher evaluation. Superintendent Ritz and three other Board members approved adding this action item to the agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Board voted to approve minutes for the April 28, May 13, and May 14 meetings.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CHAIR

There was no statement from the chair.

V. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND REPORTS

Ms. O'Brien was congratulated for being awarded teacher of the year.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comments were taken at the time of the relevant discussions during the course of the meeting.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Common School Loan Applications; B. Governing Body Plan Changes for MSD of North Posey

The Board voted unanimously to approve both items on the consent agenda.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS – ACTION

- A. Lead Partner Determinations

- Teresa Brown, Assistant Superintendent of Outreach at the Indiana Department of Education (“Department”) and Robert Guffin, Executive Director to the Board, presented a joint recommendation regarding Lead Partners at George Washington Community High School, Broad Ripple Magnet High School, John Marshall Community High School, and Glenwood Leadership Academy. The plan included a recommendation that IPS be its own Lead Partner at George Washington for the 2014-15 school year and then if established performance goals are met then the Board will support a multiple-year contract with IPS.
- Dr. Lewis Ferebee, Superintendent of Indianapolis Public Schools (“IPS”) spoke next. He stated that he believed the joint recommendation from the Department and the Board staff regarding lead partners at IPS was a happy medium. However he asked the Board to go further and consider IPS the sole lead partner of John Marshall High School along with George Washington High School, instead of just George Washington. He spoke about the importance of a network of schools, and that being

- in charge of two schools would allow for that. He said he understood the concern about capacity, but stated that two schools would allow IPS to show the Board what IPS can do.
- Some board members expressed concern over the recommendation because of concerns surrounding IPS's capacity and the prior reasons for the assignment of Lead Partners in the first place. The members praised the new leadership, but there was some concern about the risk. Ms. Neal was in favor of allowing IPS to be the Lead Partner for John Marshall. Mr. Walker expressed concern over the legality of IPS being its own Lead Partner, and said there is no track record of success as its own Lead Partner. Dr. Michelle McKeown, General Counsel to the Board, stated that the recommendation is legal because the Board maintains control of the intervention and could still modify it at will. Mr. Elsener and Ms. Whicker stated the joint recommendation was a solid plan. Ms. Whicker said she understands the goal is to eventually turn the schools back over to IPS, but had some concerns because she said the Board has a responsibility to the children. Mr. Hendry said he would be more comfortable taking this under advisement until the next meeting to allow enough time to review the materials he received the day before this meeting. Mr. Walker said he has heard great things from the new leadership at IPS, and wanted to see how they perform before taking action as recommended. He said to take action would mean accepting that the Lead Partner programs don't work and that he doesn't believe this.
 - Superintendent Ritz invited a motion and Ms. Neal moved to approve the joint recommendation regarding Lead Partners at George Washington Community High School, Broad Ripple Magnet High School, John Marshall Community High School, and Glenwood Leadership Academy and Mr. Albert seconded. The Board voted 6-4 to approve the joint recommendation. Mr. Hendry clarified that he voted no because he didn't believe there was sufficient time to deliberate on these issues, not because he was necessarily against the recommendation or any of the proposals put forth during the discussion of this action item. Mr. Hendry thanked Mr. Ferebee for all the great work he has been doing at IPS.
 - With respect to funding proposals for turnaround schools ("TSO"), the joint recommendation presented by Ms. Brown and Mr. Guffin was that, for the 2014/2015 school year, the Board directs the Department to reduce the award each TSO receives by 15% of the amount of 1003(a) SIG monies initially received by the TSO during the 2012/2013 school year. The Department and Center for Education and Career Innovation ("CECI") also proposed that, for the 2015/2016 school year, the Board directs the Department to reduce the award each TSO receives by 50% of

the amount of 1003(a) SIG monies initially received by the TSO during the 2012/2013 school year. This proposal allows for the gradual release of funds as the TSO interventions phase out after 2016; allows for more 1003(a) SIG monies to support other Indiana focus and priority schools; and promotes sustainability of the SIG program by ensuring that 1003(a) SIG monies are used for preventative measures rather than reactive or responsive measures.

- After discussion and some Board members expressing concerns, Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to adopt just the portion of the recommendation to reduce the award each TSO receives by 15% of the amount of 1003(a) SIG monies initially received by the TSO during the 2012/2013 school year. The Board voted 10-0 and the motion carried.

B. Determination on Board procedures Regarding General Public Comment

- Superintendent Ritz stated the ad hoc committee had met earlier the day of this meeting and had a recommendation for the Board. She summarized that the recommendation was to add back general comment to the Board Operating Procedures but limit it to three minutes. Ms. Neal moved to adopt the recommendation to add back general comment and expressed the importance of public input to the democratic process. Mr. Hendry stated he was frustrated with the process that took place regarding the ad hoc committee. He stated the ad hoc committee was created in March and there was not a single meeting until he received an email late last week to meet for the first time the morning before this meeting.
- Mr. Hendry felt that a short ad hoc committee meeting before this meeting for 20 or 30 minutes was not deliberative enough on such an important issue. He said he is a firm believer in public comment and improving public access to the Board. He said there are a number of issues that could be considered to improve the ability of the public to express their opinions to the Board. He gave an example that there is no way for the public currently to submit comments online to the official record of the Board. He believed the ad hoc committee should have met several times and sought input from the public. He also said he received the ad hoc committee proposed language before the committee had even met. Mr. Hendry stated he hopes this doesn't set precedent for procedure in the future. Ms. Neal said the purpose of the ad hoc committee was limited to her motion adding general comment. Ms. Neal said a second ad hoc committee could be added to look at public access further.

- Dr. Freitas said he has a hard time getting past the procedural issues regarding the ad hoc committee. He said he can't support the motion because of the process, saying the Board places trust in its committees and it's important that they deliberate sufficiently. Mr. Elsener agreed with Dr. Freitas concerning the procedure here. Superintendent Ritz said she wanted to clarify some things. She said she touched base with Ms. Neal about the proposed language before the meeting. She stated she called the meeting at 8:30 the morning of this meeting. She said she wasn't sure if her staff represented this completely but that she was willing to come in at 7 today for more time. Superintendent Ritz said she didn't feel she violated any procedures. Dr. Oliver had concerns about the process and so did Mr. Walker. However, he said the importance of public comment outweighs procedural issues.
- Superintendent Ritz invited Dr. Vic Smith to take the podium for public comment. He expressed the importance of general public comment and said he supports the changes to the Board Operating Procedures. He said under the old Board Operating Procedures sometimes there was confusion about what's on the agenda and people traveled to speak and then couldn't.
- Ms. Whicker said she appreciates the public's right to speak and likes when members of the public email her. She said she does have concern for the process here though. Mr. Hendry said he is for public comment but is objecting to the process. He said there could be other things put in the procedures to further enhance public comment. Superintendent Ritz responded that another ad hoc committee could be convened to look at further changes. Superintendent Ritz said with her schedule it was inconvenient to set the meeting before today's meeting. She said it's a simple matter in her opinion and she heard from many people that supported general comment.
- Dr. Oliver said there were several procedures violated related to this meeting. He said adding this agenda item and sending out the language did violate procedures because it was not done at least five days before the meeting. Dr. Oliver continued that it's not just this issue. He said everyone on the Board has busy schedules and it's difficult when the Board gets materials late. He said we need to start following the procedures. Mr. Watts recommended bringing this back in July. Ms. Neal said she didn't want to wait to adopt this new language. Mr. Hendry pointed out that the board members joining by phone didn't have a copy of this proposed language. The Board voted 7-3 and the motion carried. Mr. Hendry voted in favor but made clear his concerns regarding the process. Dr. Oliver, Dr. Freitas and Mr. Elsener voted no on account of the procedural issues. Mr. Watts voted yes but said it would have been much cleaner if put on the agenda for the July meeting.

C. Initiation of Rulemaking Regarding Teacher Evaluations

Dr. Freitas moved to initiate rulemaking for teacher evaluation. Dr. Oliver seconded and the Board voted 9-1 to carry the motion, with Superintendent Ritz voting no. The Board then took a 10 minute break.

-- BREAK --

IX. **BEST PRACTICES**

The Board did not discuss this item.

X. **DISCUSSION AND REPORTS**

A. SBOE staff update - Pre-K Pilot Presentation and Timeline

- Superintendent Ritz invited Melanie Brizzi, from the Family and Social Services Agency (“FSSA”) to present on this issue. She outlined how this program will play out in the future and the process for selecting the pilot counties. She said they looked at the capacity of the county to implement this program and the number of children in the county with low income and not enrolled in a pre-k program. Ms. Brizzi stated they narrowed it down to 18 counties representing areas all across the state. The 18 counties will submit readiness proposals to FSSA so they can narrow the program to five counties. She then explained the timeline. Superintendent Ritz said a challenge will be mobility of the population the program is serving.
- Claire Fiddian-Green, Special Assistant to the Governor for Education Innovation, was the next speaker. Ms. Fiddian-Green outlined the three roles of the Board in this process. First, FSSA will come back to the Board at the July 9 meeting to explain the program design parameters at that time and that the five counties may have been selected by then. Second, at the September meeting the Board will have to approve the kindergarten readiness assessment for the pilot program. Finally, at the November meeting, FSSA will consult with the Board before entering into a contract to carry out the longitudinal study.

C. April 1 Special Education Child Count

Superintendent Ritz said stated a memo had been provided to the Board and asked for any questions or comments; there were none.

B. Strategic Planning Update

Superintendent Ritz invited Rick Rozzelle, from CELT Corporation, to speak to the Board on this issue. He began by generally outlining the process and then said he would take comments from the Board to incorporate into the balanced scorecard. He said the balanced scorecard would then be voted on by the Board in the July meeting. The following comments were made by board members:

- Superintendent Ritz said some data may need to be reworked. The IREAD-3 86.3 data is not the summer data; it's not accurate because the summer data is final. The baseline for 2012-13 at 91.4% is accurate, she said.
- Regarding Scorecard letter F – measure of character and citizenship, Superintendent Ritz said these are important issues but should be addressed at the local level. She stated it also asks for a measure between subgroups and the she didn't think this was possible.
- Superintendent Ritz said 1.1.8 is a local decision. Dr. Oliver didn't want to remove it. He didn't want to dictate to localities but he said there are some broad models out there that can be used. He encouraged looking into it further and didn't think they could decide on it today. Superintendent Ritz recommended reworking to investigate other states/models and that it shouldn't be in the measures. Dr. Oliver reiterated it should be left in.
- Dr. Oliver said guidance is needed for objectives 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3. He said there are instruments and it needs to vetted property.
- Dr. Freitas said the character education part is just to provide guidance, not to dictate to local school districts. He said this should be left in because the strategic plan should be aspirational. Mr. Elsener agreed. Superintendent Ritz said guidelines are ok with her but she questioned the wording.
- Superintendent Ritz said leading indicators for 1.1.2 aren't appropriate. She said local assessments won't be good leading indicators.
- Ms. Neal said in 2.1.1 she recommended breaking it down between content degrees versus education degrees. Superintendent Ritz said diversity information is not collected among teachers and it's not needed there.
- Mr. Albert asked about compensation models included in 2.1.2. Members thought this would be a good idea.
- Superintendent Ritz said 3.1.1 has a grammatical error.
- Superintendent Ritz recommended removing the last sentence in the strategy in 3.1.3.

- Superintendent Ritz said in 3.1.6 she wanted to make sure there is enough leeway with regard to technology; she expressed concerned about being able to run that academy through a technology format.

-- Mr. Elsener left the meeting --

D. Updates on Pass Rates and Cut Scores on CASA exams

Superintendent Ritz said this would be a discussion in anticipation of a vote for next meeting. Risa Regnier, Assistant Superintendent of School Support Services, gave the Board some quick background information. Superintendent Ritz stated the Board has two decisions it will have to make: 1) whether we want to do a compensatory or a non-compensatory model of adding the scores, and 2) deciding if we want to take the panel based passing score or make another determination to stay with the “plus-one”. Pearson representatives Nancy Hahn and Barbara Appel gave the Board some detailed information regarding the model and cut score options it will be voting on at the next meeting. They explained the CASA assessment is required to be entered into a teacher preparation program in Indiana. Ms. Hahn explained that subtests are reading, math, and writing, and also explained the weighting between the multiple choice and writing portions of the test. She said CASA is aligned with the new standards. The Board then took a break for lunch.

-- BREAK --

E. Review of Resource Guide Aligned to the New Indiana Academic Standards

- Amy Horton, Assistant Superintendent for Student Achievement & Growth, discussed this issue with the Board. She said a lot of progress has been made since the May 14 Board meeting. Ms. Horton stated she would be presenting all the great work the Department has done since that meeting. She said they will be presenting to the Roundtable and then again to the Board at the end of the month for the July 1 deadline. She said, along with the plan outlaid previously to the Board, they are working on sample math problems, sample reading lists, text complexity guidance, and guidance concerning non-fiction texts. Ms. Horton said the goal is to have 100% success in the following targets: 1) awareness, 2) responsiveness, 3) support, and 4) engagement. She today’s focus is on the support component and she outlined that for the Board using a PowerPoint presentation.

- Ms. Horton stated the correlation documents have been a top priority, which are side by side analyses of the new standards and Common Core so educators can better prepare for the new standards. Ms. Horton then outlined teacher resource guides, another priority item. She said the Department differentiated the guides into math and English/language arts. Ms. Horton explained the Department was doing a text complexity rubric to help educators determine if a text is appropriate for grade level, and if it is increasing in complexity. She emphasized these are living documents that continue to be changed and improved upon in response to the needs of the field. The third priority item she discussed was guidance for instruction and assessment. She said this would be deliverable around mid-June.
- Ms. Horton then moved on to explain the Department has contacted textbook publishers in response to Ms. O'Brien's question. She stated a memo went out with textbook guidance. She said they encouraged them to work with this at the local level. Superintendent Ritz said this was sent out May 28 and the correlation documents were sent out with it.
- Dr. Oliver said he was concerned because he didn't see math in the materials. He said he remembered the Roundtable resolution well and he is not seeing everything in there that the Roundtable wants to see, like examples and reading lists. Ms. Horton responded that most of the documents are close to be finished, just not quite in final form for viewing today. Superintendent Ritz stated that the reading list will be different because they are taking a different approach; they will be seeing what the field is using first before putting anything out.
- Dr. Oliver expressed concern that we aren't ready. Superintendent Ritz clarified that it goes to the Roundtable first and then back to the Board, the Board is not approving before it goes to the Roundtable. Dr. Oliver clarified that at a prior meeting it was stated that the Board would have input before the materials are presented to the Roundtable; he said it's hard to have input without a product. Deputy Superintendent Danielle Shockey said the actual documents can be sent to the Board as pdf files. Dr. Oliver expressed disappointment with this because during the standards process a concern people had was that these documents would be in final form by June 15 and that the Board would have input in the process before it went to the Roundtable. Superintendent Ritz said all the documents will be sent electronically and board members can send back input. Superintendent Ritz said it was never the intent of the Department that the Board not have input. Ms. Neal said her concern was that a resource guide is never a good substitute for strong content based standards. She said it would be her preference to have a resource guide that

referred to significant genres, areas of literatures, and exemplar texts. Superintendent Ritz said they can include the genre information.

F. ESEA Waiver Update

- Ms. Shockey spoke to this issue. She began by saying this was an update since the last Board meeting discussion on this issue. She said it's a fluid process and there has been a lot of back and forth between the United States Department of Education ("US Department") and the Indiana Department of Education (referred to as the "IN Department" in this section of the minutes only). Ms. Shockey said she would be summarizing the calls. She said the US Department proposed three calls. Last week she said on the call the US Department said the IN Department could send in documents for review before the deadline; Ms. Shockey said until then they were under the impression that could not be done. She said so far they sent 1) a signed letter that certified Indiana's standards and college and career ready, 2) a draft of Focus and Priority schools, 3) a draft of an assessment plan outline, 4) draft of teacher and principal evaluation and support systems, and 5) a draft of the standards. She said there was a lot of feedback on the assessment plan outline so there were a total of three iterations submitted. She said she received the latest information the day before this meeting in the afternoon which is why the Board just received it late the night before.
- Mr. Walker asked where the hang ups are; Ms. Shockey responded that there have been significant discussions around assessment. Dr. Oliver stated it has been hard to get information as this has progressed along. He said he thinks there are concerns around assessments, the use of RISE 2.5, and monitoring. Ms. Shockey explained the calls are about how to eliminate those issues. Dr. Oliver said the Board is in the dark as far as what is being submitted by the IN Department. Ms. Shockey responded that the plan is outlined on the slides. Dr. Oliver said on a matter of this urgency he believed the updates should be coming directly from the chair. Superintendent Ritz outlined the things that have been done in the process with the US Department. She said the drafts will be put out publicly the week of June 16 for public comment. She said we have given the Board every component in our plans.
- Mr. Walker asked if there is a better understanding of what the US Department was objecting to regarding the teacher evaluation. Superintendent Ritz responded they aren't objections, they want to see a robust plan for teacher and principal evaluation, monitoring, and assistance. Superintendent Ritz said they want documentation of what has occurred since August. She said they are presenting

evidence of what they have been doing, and then submitting a high quality plan going forward. Superintendent Ritz stated part of the problem is that Congress was supposed to reauthorize No Child Left Behind and they didn't. She said now extensions must be sought and no states have received an extension at this point because Indiana is the first cohort. She stated the initial waiver was a finite two years.

- Ms. Shockey moved to the next call, which dealt with the standards and assessment. The US Department asked for the certification letter which they have, she said. Ms. Shockey said they are also providing information on support and monitoring as well. She said most discussion has been around assessment. Superintendent Ritz spoke about the assessment piece. She said this is the most important discussion they will be having. She began by explaining some background, including the original plan. She said the US Department has said there must be a fully operational ISTEP in the spring of 2015 that is aligned to the new standards. Superintendent Ritz said achievement and growth data from the new assessment will be provided to the districts and the schools. She said they will be using this information for statewide technical support and professional development. Superintendent Ritz went on to say this data will be submitted to the US Department to satisfy reporting requirements, and school grades will be calculated for information and school improvement purposes. Information from the 2015 ISTEP will also be used to calculate teacher and principal effectiveness for professional development. Further, she said Focus and Priority schools will continue to be modified.
- She said there are concerns around accountability and teacher effectiveness since the test is aligned to new standards. Superintendent Ritz said students and teachers would be left with seven months to prepare for the new test. She said in 2014-15 this test will be treated as a baseline. She went on to say the new assessment will be more rigorous, which means there will likely be a drop in student performance in the 2014-15 grades. Consequently, Superintendent Ritz said there have been discussions about holding constant the 2014-15 accountability grades. She said grades would be released though. The same would go for student growth in teacher evaluation calculations. She also iterated that all interventions will continue. Ms. Shockey said historically there has been a year and seven months given to transition.
- Deborah Dailey, Director of Information Services at Indiana Department of Education, expounded on the student growth issue in teacher evaluations. She said measures of growth will not be available in 2015 because all growth is based on previous ISTEP data. She stated this means a transitional formula of growth must be

- established as required by the US Department. Ms. Dailey said baselines will have to be established.
- Ms. Neal asked if the US Department is asking Indiana to do something illogical and not practical. She asked if the waiver is worth it. Superintendent Ritz said it's worth it; she said it allows flexibility with federal dollars. She said school budgets are used to this flexibility now and that's the main issue. Another issue, she said, is that Indiana would have to go back to subgroups. Superintendent Ritz said we, and other states, are in position because Congress could not get together and reauthorize No Child Left Behind. Dr. Oliver agreed and explained the importance of the waiver. He said the effects on students and schools would be negative. He said if the waiver is lost a majority of schools will fail to make AYP for two consecutive years. He said help for many struggling students will not be there. Dr. Oliver said he still has issues with some of the things he is hearing. He said systems were in place but then some things were not being done at the time of the August visit. Dr. Shockey said the US Department doesn't want evidence pre-August; they want evidence from then to now. Dr. Oliver asked to see the evidence of monitoring; Superintendent Ritz assured him there was evidence of that. Superintendent Ritz then directed the conversation back to assessment.
 - Mr. Walker said he thought the proposal really needs to be considered because we really could be creating a problem where one doesn't exist now. He said the question he had earlier was do we have a problem with accountability in terms of renewal. And the answer was no. Mr. Walker went on to say if we go and try to exempt for a one year period the actual impact of accountability he has no reason to believe that the federal government would accept that. Superintendent Ritz responded that the US Department of Education would consider holding constant 2013-14 accountability grade assigned to schools, and that they would consider excluding ISTEP student performance data from teacher effectiveness calculations if we provide everything in part 2. Mr. Walker stated he thought it's a bad idea period, just on the principal of it. He went on to say we would be creating a problem on the accountability side for the renewal of the waiver.
 - Superintendent Ritz explained there are states like Florida that have announced that they were holding constant their grades. She said there are several other states in our same predicament that got out of PARCC and had to scramble to get new assessments in place by 14-15, and so we're not the only state that is asking for this type of consideration. Superintendent Ritz continued that they haven't given these considerations yet but we're not the only one that they are considering. She said she

- put this out there because we are in a situation of having to give an assessment that no one has experienced yet
- Mr. Hendry asked if the reasons the considerations are being proposed is because we have newly adopted standards and we are going to have a new assessment. Superintendent Ritz said yes, and not be able to calculate a growth component, as you heard Deb say, as we would like to have it calculated. We are going to have to have a bridge calculation of growth between one assessment to another assessment she said. Mr. Hendry asked if this is the case in Florida, where they had a set of standards and they changed their standards. He asked if it was materially different for them. Superintendent Ritz stated she didn't know that it was part of their waiver. She said they put a freeze on their grades for the first year of their test, just like Indiana did in 2009. Mr. Hendry said there were a number of people who criticized us because the standards didn't change that much. He asked if the assessment is going to materially change such that you need a full year.
 - Dr. Michele Walker, Director of Student Assessment at the Department, explained that rigor is probably the biggest concern with regard to the new assessment. Dr. McKeown explained concerns around opportunity to learn are less regarding access to content and more relating to rigor and fairness; she explained the latter two have to do with item type because the item types will be different. She explained the need for an exposure is less about the content and more about the item types for the assessment; the type of writing prompt will differ substantially, Dr. McKeown said.
 - Dr. McKeown went on to say that she recommend that the Board mandate an exposure opportunity that would provide access to a representative sample of items and provide student level results, so that both students and teachers are able to get meaningful information about how they are performing under the new item types. She also recommended that this happen no later than the end of September. She stated how that exactly looks we could put in the good hands of Dr. Walker to think about how big the window should be, etc. Dr. McKeown reiterated that to the extent that we are going to operationalize the assessment in the spring that has new item types, we need to make sure we are providing an exposure opportunity. She went on to state that that was the conversation we had early on this year that we would provide a pilot or exposure opportunity in May of this year, of the 13-14 school year. She continued that in April of this year we talked about bumping it to September. Dr. McKeown said this is not a strikingly different recommendation than what we have been talking about. She stated its essential because of the change of

rigor and the items. Lastly, she said when it comes to opportunity to learn, access to content is not really the issue.

- Superintendent Ritz asked Dr. McKeown if she was recommending that we hold everybody to accountability and teacher evaluation. Dr. McKeown responded that might have been an overstatement of what she recommended. She said she was recommending that if we are going to operationalize an assessment for 14-15 that has these new item types, the college and career ready item types, that we should ensure that all students in Indiana have an opportunity for exposure at the front end of the school year to understand how they are going to perform. It needs to be a representative sample, it needs to provide student level results so that both the students and the teachers have information on how the students are performing, she explained. She clarified she was not making a policy recommendation about how the Board should respond to accountability freezes or removing entirely the objective data component for teacher evaluation.
- Superintendent Ritz then inquired if she was actually from a legal standpoint saying that we should operationalize that and actually give back student data and actually use it for the purposes of all students having formalized exposure to the questions.
- Dr. McKeown responded that when we say operationalize, that means the data is being used for things like accountability. She explained this would be more like a pilot or exposure opportunity early in the 2014-15 school year. The data would not be used for anything other than to provide information to students and teachers. So I am not proposing an operational assessment for August/September, she stated. She clarified what she is proposing is that we need to do something that has always been in the plan but mandate that it is offered to all students, and there is obviously some flexibility around how that will look.
- Dr. Oliver said he wanted to clarify something. He said if we are going to do what you are saying, and we are going to take it seriously, number one it's got to be aligned with the current standards and number two it's got to be truly representative of the kind of questions that are going to be asked. He stated he wanted to clarify that because there was a comment made that we were on that trajectory in the spring and we delayed that but it's not the same thing. He said this is not CoreLink, it's a representative sample of the types of questions and they need to be aligned to the new standards, which is different than what we talked about this spring. Dr. McKeown clarified she was referring to a representative sample.
- Mr. Walked asked a legal question surrounding the Indiana statutes and rules surrounding accountability. He said there are statutes and rules that require, such as

Public Law 221, interventions on a timetable and teacher evaluations. He asked what authority or jurisdiction this Board have to suspend that. Dr. McKeown stated she can't say the Board does have that authority to suspend things such as the teacher evaluation. She stated 20-28-11.5-4 precisely requires that there be an objective data component that significantly informs the teacher evaluation

- Mr. Walker asked if it was Dr. McKeown's opinion that the proposal to not apply it for a year basically suspends those. Dr. McKeown responded yes, it would suspend both those as well as the intervention language in the statutes. She said in the calls with US Department, they were very specific that they were not weighing in on state law. She said they were very careful in their language to say that they were not saying yay or nay, that they would consider a robust plan put forward by Indiana about how Indiana would ensure that we were maintaining interventions and being thoughtful about the data that we see for 14-15. Superintendent Ritz asked Dr. Walker to give an update on the fall assessment piece.
- Dr. Walker said you might remember that we talked about having a matrix sample in the spring and we talked with the Board in April about actually moving that to the fall so that we could align it to our new standards. She said it would be assessing all the item types and things of that nature, giving data back to schools and students but it wouldn't have any stakes attached to it. She stated that's similar to what we are talking about right now. She added that what we are also looking at in April is more of having an experience college and career readiness assessment so that parents, students, community members, or anyone could go to a non-secure site on the web this fall and actually experience the item types the students would see in the spring. Superintendent Ritz clarified that would be in addition to what Dr. McKeown was suggesting. Dr. McKeown agreed and said it would just be us having a formal conversation now, because it's June, to ensure that we can talk about preparing and what that looks like and when the window would be, etc. She said it's to ensure that exposure opportunity and to provide the data to students and parents.
- Mr. Albert stated he liked the exposure idea, and expressed concern over the grade freeze and the affect that could have on intervention schools. He also recommended possibly being able to measure growth in the same calendar year. Ms. Dailey responded that we would need a full data set in order to do that. She said the sample may not be sufficient but Dr. Walker could follow up with this. Mr. Albert responded that if we could get a sufficient sample that would solve the problem of the accountability freeze.

- Ms. Whicker commented that she didn't want to be backed in a corner where next year in 2015-16, because the test is different, we would be in a position to have to freeze test scores again. Superintendent Ritz said all data will be reported. Ms. Whicker stated reporting it and saying you're accountable for it are two different things. Ms. Shockey said the US Department said two years would never be considered.
- Mr. Watts asked about what happens if the US Department accepts this but it violates state statute. Dr. McKeown responded with a few points First, she said she didn't want to make representations that the US Department has committed to accepting this plan because they have not. They simply said they were willing to consider a robust plan from Indiana about how an operationalized assessment for 14-15 would take effect. She continued that if you submit a plan and make commitments to the US Department that is not compliant with state statute then that's a different set of trouble. She explained there are multiple factors to balance here and that is one of the reasons she said as counsel there are policy decisions for the Board to make regarding whether or not you remove the objective data component from teacher evaluation, and whether you freeze accountability. But in order to make sure we are putting the right steps into place we need to provide the exposure opportunity and that gives you more flexibility in terms of the decisions you do make, she said. Dr. McKeown added that it's the appropriate thing to do for the teachers and students so when they do take the test in the spring they will be able to get the most reliable data they can from it. Superintendent Ritz said this is the beginning of the conversation and we have joint work left to do.
- Mr. Hendry asked if the 2014-15 test is considered the baseline year, but there is not accountability tied in with that, what's the incentive to perform on that test? Dr. Walker responded that the data will be reported and shared with parents. Superintendent Ritz added that we still have to do AMOs, interventions, etc.
- Deb Dailey opined that if you take a look at page three, which is part two under feedback and support for schools, the third bullet item for AMOs, this is annual measurable objectives. Let's think of this as AYP light, she stated. What the Department of Education must report to the US Department of Education is whether or not subgroups met their goals. Included in the waiver are goals for every subgroup; we must report whether each of those subgroups met their goals. She continued by explaining we'll still be required to report on whether or not those subgroups met their goals. The last bullet on this list says Indiana will continue to notify and monitor reward schools based on subgroups. When utilizing these subgroups we are talking about AMO, which is used for English Language learners

and whether they met their goals. Each of the program areas will still have to use 2015 data for their accountability purposes. What we're talking about is the overall A-F grade, and not reporting the overall A-F grade in calculating that, Ms. Dailey explained.

- Dr. Oliver asked how the Board or Department can consider a proposal that violates state law. Dr. McKeown iterated that this wasn't her proposal and Superintendent Ritz stated it's not our proposal yet either. Superintendent Ritz said this is the beginning of dialogue and conversation to explore what it is that we might be able to do regarding any of these implications. And so we're going to having joint work amongst us, she said. She stated her legal team has already begun to look at legal pieces regarding this. She also asked everyone to keep in mind that we did actually hold accountability designations for the 2009 spring test. So, we've already done this before when we went to a new test. She continued that we have to go back and look and see how that was all done, but it's been done before.
- Dr. Oliver said time is running out and asked who would make the call about a submission to the US Department that could violate Indiana law. Dr. McKeown responded that she believed the Board would have a weigh in given the Board's legal authority around accountability and assessment. She said she did think the Board must authorize the way this entire picture looks.
- Mr. Walker added that he didn't think there should be a state test mandated in the fall. He said local school districts should be able to deal with that. He said they're aware the test is coming and many of them do assessments throughout the year. Mr. Walker felt they can best get their kids prepared. He went on to say that there will be sample on the website for them to prepare and that he didn't think a new mandated state test is the answer.
- Ms. Shockey then moved to the issue of Focus and Priority schools. She said the IN Department had some questions about the appropriateness of amendments. Specifically, there was a question about a school that is a D for two years in a row becoming an F and if that could be changed. The US Department gave her places to look for resources. The second issue involved clarity around interventions having to be in place for three years. The US Department stated they were fine with that amendment. Ms. Shockey also said there would be public comment taken on the amendments and said more input would be given at the special meeting later in June.
- Mr. Hendry asked about the purpose of the special meeting. Superintendent Ritz responded that there may be business to take and information to share regarding

the waiver, a special education assessment, and then a standards resource document. Dr. Oliver asked for documents five days ahead of time.

-- Mr. Walker left the meeting --

G. HEA 1005 Update

Dr. Walker presented to the Board regarding HEA 1005. She presented the threshold and the three options the Board has to choose from. Dr. Walker walked through data board members requested at the prior meeting. She said she proposed 10% threshold because it was the statewide average. Ms. Shockey gave some information regarding the accompanying survey as well. Dr. Walker recommended Option A in her presentation.

H. Assessment Update

Dr. Walker gave an update on the 2015 ISTEP and the NCSC assessments. She started by showing the 2013 numbers compared to the 2014 numbers. She explained the data obtained from schools and some issues regarding online testing versus paper/pencil. Dr. Walker explained some test disruptions and how those issues were addressed. Ms. Whicker praised the parent network site. Lastly, Dr. Walker went through NCSC, Indiana's alternate that must be aligned to the new standards.

XI. BOARD OPERATIONS

Board operations was not discussed.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Superintendent Ritz invited a motion to adjourn and Board voted to adjourn the meeting.